

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Application No. 10/501,424</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Applicant(s) HEKSTRA ET AL</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Examiner CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Art Unit 2621</td> </tr> </table>	Application No. 10/501,424	Applicant(s) HEKSTRA ET AL	Examiner CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE	Art Unit 2621
Application No. 10/501,424	Applicant(s) HEKSTRA ET AL				
Examiner CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE	Art Unit 2621				

All Participants:

(1) CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE.

(2) Thomas H. Ham.

Date of Interview: 18 February 2010

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
5, 6, 8, and 10

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
The interview discussed what the examiner believed at the time of his initial search and findings as allowable subject matter.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Chikaodili Anyikire/
Patent Examiner AU 2621

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)